

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

This Amendment supplements the remarks in the Response After Final Rejection, which the Advisory Action found not to place the application in condition for allowance, because of the Examiner's view that the "beam splitter" is not a folding mirror.

Without acceding to this view, Claim 85 has been amended to recite that the reduction projection catadioptric optical system is devoid of reflective surfaces that bend an optical axis. Certainly, the beam splitter of Furter has a reflective surface that bends an optical axis. Accordingly, Claim 85 and the claims dependent thereon clearly distinguish patentably from Furter. The deficiencies of Furter are not compensated by the secondary reference, Williamson, relied upon in the rejection of Claims 98 and 99.

All of the claims now presented are believed to be clearly allowable.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this

paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NHS:lmb

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive  
Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 903-9000

By: Nelson H. Shapiro  
Nelson H. Shapiro  
Reg. No. 17,095

June 18, 2004